A Philosophy of Education

The philosophy of John Dewey has long been of interest to a number of Catholic philosophers who have suspected that, Dewey's animus against anti-naturalism notwithstanding, the path which Dewey had hacked out through the philosophical wilderness might serve their own purposes equally well. Dewey's emphasis upon social change guided by intelligence, they were quick to perceive, showed respect for both science and humanism, and his educational theories, despite the rampant misunderstanding of them and the clumsy, counterproductive ways in which they were implemented, were seen to be capable of providing educational thinkers with a lighthouse beacon of sanity and rationality. Sr. Hartman's essay has the merit of letting us see the congeniality of her Maryknoll approach and Dewey's stress upon humanistic inquiry. It has the additional merit of showing the convergence of both in philosophy for children.

Mathew Lipman

While trying to organize my thoughts regarding education in its diverse aspects, I became aware of a confusion of feelings and memories rising to the surface of my consciousness, all demanding to be taken into account. It is only natural, I'm sure, that a person of my age who not only is a Catholic nun, but a Catholic nun whose experience in education has been acquired almost exclusively in Latin America, would necessarily view the topic of a philosophy of education from a perspective influenced by these factors.

In many ways, both my age and my vocation have given me some advantages. During my years in education, I have seen much change and growth in the Church's philosophical and theological lines of thought which have greatly affected educational attitudes, curriculum and methodology, and consequently, also the views of us educators within the Church. One of those changes, for example, shifted the emphasis from "the soul and its eternal salvation in another world" to "the integral development and well-being of the whole person in the here and now." A document from the Second Vatican Council states: "It is the human person who must be saved . . . Hence the pivotal point . . . will be the person himself, whole and entire, body and soul, heart and conscience, mind and will."[1]

This holistic approach was applied specifically to education by the Latin American Bishops in their conclusive documents that resulted from the Episcopal Conference II held in Medellin, Colombia in 1968. They called on education to answer the challenge of the times. But the call was not for just any system of education: "We would call it a 'liberating education', that is, one that transforms the student into the agent of his own development."[2] It seemed to them that " . . . the content of the programmed studies are, in general, too abstract and formalistic. The didactic methods are more concerned about the transference of knowledge than for the creation, among other values, of a critical spirit."[3] The Bishops envisioned education as that which

> " . . . ought to become creative so as to foresee the new type of society that we look for in Latin America; it should concentrate its efforts on the personalization of the new generations, deepening the consciousness of their human dignity, favoring their self-determination and promoting their sense of community. It should be open to dialogue in order to enrich itself with the values that the young people intuit and discover as worthwhile for the future, and so to foster greater understanding in the youth, both among themselves and with adults."[4]

This more integrated view of the human person brought pressure on educators to re-think the content and methodology of the then current programs of study. Unfortunately, for many years the efforts expended for this were largely directed to non-formal education, and that mainly for adults. Pablo Freire anticipated by several years this redirection of educational emphasis with his experiments in teaching illiterates in Recife, Brazil. He was convinced that men and women, especially " . . . the oppressed must see themselves as men (and women) engaged in the ontological and historical vocation of being more fully human."[5] For him, and soon for many others involved in literacy programs, "reflection and action become imperative when one does not erroneously attempt to dichotomize the content of humanity from its historical forms."[6]

In Guatemala, during the last half of the 60's, I myself organized and taught in adult alphabetization programs similar to Freire's, and was delighted with the awakening of an awareness of personal worth in the participants and with their growing ability to recognize, criticize and act upon the existing situations of poverty and oppression. But, in spite of that experience with adults, as principal of a parish school, I had to conform to government programs of study for the children, programs that followed the "banking" concept of education so well described by Pablo Freire.[7]

A more participative, student-centered type of formal education broke into some of the private schools in Central America in the early 70's. Staffed by religious congregations of European origins, especially Spanish and French; these institutions imported the "personalized education" system that had begun to gain popularity, particularly among Church schools, in those countries. The personalistic philosophy of Emmanuel Mounier found resonance in the pedagogical innovation of Pierre Faure, S.J.[8] He found the same humanistic, praxis-oriented approach to education promoted by Pablo Freire in Pope Paul VI's encyclical *Populorum Progressio,* where the development of the person is seen as a life-long vocation, a process throughout which one is constantly called to responsible self-actuation, to self-conquest and transcendence that leads to a greater integrity.[9]

Pierre Faure's pedagogy as " . . . personal and community oriented," is a pedagogy

> " . . . whose spirit is directed to each of the individuals on whom it falls so that he is fulfilled as a person, that is to say, that he reaches the maximum of initiative, of responsibility, of commitment and spiritual life in a res-

sponsible and free commitment to the men and women of the social community in which he is growing and developing."[10]

It is this "personalized education" that, at the moment, holds the attention of many Chilean educators, at least those in private schools, and most especially once again, those responsible for Chruch schools. Perhaps Dewey would not have recognized the name, but from what I have gathered from the various forms in use, "personalized education" pays more than lip homage to his philosophical ideas on education. Consciously intended or not, the description of Faure's pedagogy quoted above resembles Dewey's "Article I - What Education Is" from *My Pedagogic Creed:*

> "The child's own instincts and powers furnish the material and give the starting-point for all education . . . Education, therefore, must begin with a psychological insight into the child's capacities, interests, and habits. It must be controlled at every point by reference to these same considerations. These powers, interests, and habits must be continually interpreted - we must know what they mean. They must be translated into terms of their social equivalents - into terms of what they are capable of in the way of social service."[11]

This common denominator of focusing on the child in the process of development as the center of all educational activity has forced me to open my mental file and pull out the concepts I had tucked away regarding "person", especially in relation to the child and his education. I had thought my ideas on the topic were adequate until some of the schools using the personalized education approach asked for the Philosophy for Children Program. I had to be sure that I was speaking their language. And just as when updating any filed material, I found some notions had to be discarded, others needed to be re-thought. Some concepts seemed to be out of place and had to be put in better order. Many needed to be explicated so as to lose their vagueness, and, of course, a wealth of new ideas were added.

An adequate definition of "person" would be difficult to find because none could exhaust the human mystery which is constantly revealing new facets of itself, or showing unkown dimensions of previously discovered elements. We speak of components of the "person", trying to understand better the whole by studying the parts, yet often missing the forest for the trees. The very dynamism of the " person" creates problems in the effort to say that it is thus and so. The "person" never really is, but is always becoming, is always in the state of progression. The "person is not a totality, but is constantly becoming a totality."[12] Every person is really

> " . . . a vocation that consists in being called to develop himself, to conquer himself, to transcend himself . . . To be a person . . . is to be a person in an uninterrupted growth by means of creative action. This growth and creativity are directed towards the fullness of being."[13]

This process of becoming, of growing to a plenitude of being must naturally affect our concept of how a person learns, or how he is educated. The center is the child - he is the subject of education, not its object. "Education is a vital reality conditioned by concrete circumstances and called to overcome them from the very situation in which the subject of education finds himself."[14] Education thus conceived must foster intellectual curiosity rather than dish out information; it must promote a conduct based on values more than the strict fulfillment of precepts; it must aim at constant personal growth instead of wasting energy on a sensational education that has for its goal efficiency, competence, good manners and polished speech that categorize the person as well-educated.

Obviously, a child has experiences from conception onward - experiences that continually modify his life for better or for worse. "As an individual passes from one situation to another, his world, his environment, expands or contracts . . . A fully integrated personality exists only when successive experiences are integrated with one another."[15]

What is responsible for this integration of experiences with which a person is educated? Earlier in my teaching career, I'd, probably point to the parents of the child and then to his teachers as liable for the interpretation of the child's experiences (from their adult perspective, of course). They would also orient the child's response to his experiences by a code of "do's and, don't's." Little attention and less time would be given the child to reflect upon the meaning of the experiences, to assimilate them into the already existing accumulation of previous experiences or to formulate a personal response to the situation that would lay down norms to guide future conduct.

Now, however, if I am to allow the child to be the center and the subject of his education, it is his inner perspective or power to "mind" his experiences that must read meaning into them, respond to them and integrate them into his process of becoming "person". Teilhard de Chardin says " . . . the mind is essentially the power of synthesis and organization,"[16] an idea very akin to the thought expressed by Dewey: "The mind is . . . precisely the power to understand things in terms of the use made of them."[17]

Dewey's concern with the popular notion of the mind being a separate entity from the body is well taken, and his development of this thesis in *Art and Experience* lends support to the above mentioned holistic approach to education. Mind taken in a

> "substantial sense . . . forms the background upon which every new contact with surroundings is projected . . . This active and eager background lies in wait and engages whatever comes its way so as to absorb it into its own being. Mind as background is formed out of modifications of the self that have occurred in the process of prior interactions with environment."[18]

A very interesting passage by James Michener in his recent novel, *Space* gives a modern, technological flavor to the theme of "mind":

> "It's much like a human life, Mott reflected as Mariner drew ever closer to Mars. A man spends his youth accumulating data, billions of bits, and some he must

handle in real time, some he stores in his computer for later inspection. And balance in life consists in handling in real time those problems which cannot be delayed, then recalling more significant data during periods of reflection, when long-term decisions can be developed. And as we grow older we recall great segments of experience, deriving such lessons from them as our personal computers are able to decipher."[19]

Understanding "mind" as "possession of and response to meanings"[20] is a far cry from the "banking" concept of education where the mind is seen as a receptacle into which the teachers deposit knowledge.[21] Even the concept of body takes on a more integrated function in the historical development of "person" when "mind denotes the whole system of meanings as they are embodied in the workings of organic life."[22] I very much like Dewey's description of the physical participation in the process of getting meaning for greater fullness of life from experience:

> " . . . when men begin to observe and think they must use the nervous system and other organic structures which existed independently and antecedently. That the use reshapes the prior materials so as to adapt them more efficiently and freely to the uses to which they are put . . . is an expression of the common fact that anything changes according to the interacting field it enters. . . . Thus the external or environmental affairs, primarily implicated in living processes and later implicated in discourse, undergo modifications in acquiring meanings and becoming objects of mind, and yet are as 'physical' as ever they were. . . . Every thought and meaning has its substratum in some organic act of absorption or elimination or seeking, or turning away from, of destroying or caring for, of signaling or responding. It roots in some definite act of biological behavior."[23]

Such a lengthy quote may be a bit out of place, but coming from a tradition of "soul and body separateness," I find it refreshing to read a non-Church philosopher's concept of the unity of the human make-up, and regret that such a marked distinction between the physical and non-physical components of the person was taught for so many centuries.

A system of education that respects the students as the subjects of their growth as persons must think over its concepts of the rights of those involved with the children in this process. That children have a right to an education is hardly disputable, but do they not have the right to the type of education that considers them as persons in the process of becoming? Have they not the right to enjoy the thrill of seeing themselves as the subject of the experiences that propel them forward toward greater integration - ". . . the individual seems to become more content to be a process rather than a product."[24] Do children not have the right to learn how to learn by evaluating their experiences with good reasoning skills instead of being indoctrinated with certain beliefs held by their adult mentors?[25] And is there not a right for a child to progress in his development according to his capacity to respond to the call to become "person"? Such a response " . . . is nothing else but a commitment that rests on the possibility of the person being capable of making it because he is responsible, that is to say, able to make a response."[26] Such a free and response-able participation by the child is hardly possible when some 30 or 40 (and often more) students must march to the same rhythm hammered out by the teacher in the traditional classroom.

My thoughts on the rights of parents concern society as a whole. Both have the right to expect that their children and future adult citizens will have adequate facilities where they can learn how to become persons. Sub-human housing that deprives families of needed privacy, of material necessities such as water and light, unemployment caused by economic repression severly limit the parents' possibilities of self-actuation and that of their offspring. Government budgets that designate enormous sums of money for the army and armament and very little for education are denying their society the right to renew itself with educated, creative and mature citizens.[27]

In my work as teacher-trainer for the Philosophy for Children Program, the greatest gratification has been the joy expressed by the teachers in having the opportunity to learn a way of breaking through the traditional method of teaching. A written note I received on the last day of a recent course reads in part: "I am grateful to God and to you for this wonderful opportunity to reflect and dialogue together. This experience will improve my relationship with others, but above all, it will help me in the difficult but beautiful mission of collaborating with the children in their development as persons."

I share this note to point up what I consider as a primary right of teachers - that of having the opportunity to prepare themselves to be person-educators instead of subject-matter dispensers.

Realizing what a privilege it is to accompany another in the process of becoming "person", a teacher quickly acknowledges that she is also on the way, and the student-teacher relationship takes on a new meaning. The role of a know-it-all who deposits information in the empty head of the know-nothing child is recognized as having no connection with real education - the child becomes a unique, precious individual with unique, precious capabilities waiting to evolve as experiences are shared, evaluated and acted upon. At times the teacher becomes the learner, and the child, the teacher. A mutual bond develops between them as the child recognizes in the teacher "a profound and constant attitude of confidence in the student and in his possibilities; a profound respect for the work of the student, and an attitude of acceptance and of listening."[28]

Perhaps the most important in a teacher-student relationship is the conviction of the part of both that " . . . nobody else can give you an education . . . I really have to get it myself."[29]

When attempting to give some sort of definition to "person" by describing the characteristics which mark him, no one fails to highlight that a person is fundamentally a being who can only exist in intersubjective relationships expressed through communication.[30] This relationship among persons, with all that that implies, is what we call society. The structures of society are numberless, and the search for the ideal form of organization of social groups will probably continue forever.

But as inadequate as our known democracy may be at times, it has elements that foster the growth of the person that can only be appreciated when one has experienced a style of government that impedes, or at least, hinders that growth, an example being a military dictatorship.

It seems that Dewey portrays a social Utopia when he defines the desired society as one

> " . . . in which every person shall be occupied in something which makes the lives of others better worth living, and which accordingly makes the ties which binds persons together more perceptible - which breaks down barriers of distance between them. It denotes a state of affairs in which the interest of each in his work is uncoerced and intelligent: based upon its congenialty to his own aptitudes."[31]

His idea of the ideal society reflects the early Church as described in the Acts of the Apostles.[32] This calls for the active participation of mature members of society or of the community in the formation of the values that order their lives together is based on a faith in human intelligence that sees each individual as capable of contributing something toward the general good.

In such a society, education has a primary role in directing and guiding young citizens in their interpretation of their experiences and their responses to them so that their actions are internally controlled through an identity of interest and understanding with those with whom they live. Schools should regulate the learning experiences of the students so that the particular bits of knowledge presented to them can be related to the already possessed knowledge in order that this continuity of relationship enables the children " . . . to refer their way of acting to what others are doing and make it fit it. This directs their actions to a common result, and gives an understanding common to the participants."[33]

If it is true that a person is in a continual process of growth, of becoming, then the function of the school is " . . . to insure the continuance of education by organizing the powers that insure growth. The inclination to learn from life itself and to make the condition of life such that all will learn in the process of living is the finest product of schooling."[34]

When the learning activities offered in a school do not promote the development of an individual's powers in a meaningful way, when they are based on the quantity of information given instead of the quality of purposive action, the school is failing to fulfill the primary objective of education. To guide a child to purposive action there must be an organic connection with what he has already experienced and what the subject-matter presently brings to his attention. An educational activity must be carefully motivated:

> "When the subject-matter has been psychologized, that is, viewed as an outgrowth of present tendencies and activities, it is easy to locate in the present some obstacle, intellectual, practical, or ethical, which can be handled more adequately if the truth in question be mastered:"[35]

The element of discovery is essential in educational activities if the reasoning powers of the child are to be exercised and honed to sharpness. if the subject-matter is presented as material to be memorized, the student is deprived of the experience of reflecting on the material given him, of relating it to already accumulated knowledge and of logically incorporating it into that knowledge. And as a result, the matter is not "his own", but imposed from without, it will contribute little, if anything, to purposive action in the child's life which makes him less apt to participate creatively in his community.

Obviously, the traditional method of teaching gave the teacher the upper hand in the classroom. She had a determined amount of material to transfer to the heads of the students in a set period of time. A firm hand was a "must" if there was to be good discipline which meant silence and order so that there was no wasting of time. The teacher was the "queen pin" in the classroom and everything revolved around her.

In an educational system that values the child as his own agent of growth, the tables are turned - activities revolve around the other "pins", and the "queen pin" becomes greatly dependent upon the students. She must

> " . . . select those things within the range of existing experiences that have the promise and potentiality of presenting new problems which by stimulating new ways of observation and judgment will expand the area of future experience. . . . Connectedness in growth must be her constant watchword."[36]

The educator must be alert to guide the students in "intelligent observation and judgment by which a purpose is developen." [37] She has to be careful not to go to the other extreme of the traditional methodology by not making suggestions or not referring to her larger experiences and broader horizons. She should be

> ". . . intelligently aware of the capacities, needs and past experience of those under instruction, and, secondly, to allow the suggestion made to develop into a plan and project by means of the futher suggestions contributed and organized into a whole by the members of the group. . . . The essential point is that the purpose grow and take shape through the process of social intelligence."[38]

Teaching of any quality aims at much more than simply preparing a child to take his place in society as a passive member, as one who conforms to the demands, fads and prejudices of the current social pattern without ever making any waves. Nor does it train a child as one might train an animal to respond automatically to certain stimuli. It applies the principles of continuity and interaction of experience so that the future is taken into account at every stage of the educational process, which, to my mind, is unending. By guiding the children to use every experience their school life affords them as meaningful to their life, they will be prepared to find meaning in future experiences of deeper quality and broader scope. "We always live at the time we live and not at some other time, and only by extracting at each present time the full meaning of each present experience are we prepared for doing the same thing in the future."[39]

Providing students with opportunities to use meanings acquired through previous experiences to find meaning in a present situation is to guide them toward knowledge, which Dewey defines as "a perception of those connections of an object which determine its applicability in a given situation."[40] In other words, we respond to an immediate experience not as an unrelated occurrence, but as an event that has connections with other happenings that are already components of the "mind".

Other philosophers[41] contend that "knowing" carries the condition that the one who knows can prove his knowledge as true by proper evidence. I'm not so sure that these definitions are totally imcompatible, but I'm inclined to see Dewey's as a more dynamic, growth-producing concept of knowledge. In order for an experience to lend meaning to one's life, and thereby contribute to the process of becoming, an individual must reach into his intellectual resources that have been organized into his personal disposition in order to be able " . . . to adapt the environment to our needs and to adapt our aims and desires to the situation in which we live."[42] Acquiring knowledge is commonly called learning, although learning taken in another sense signifies the sum total of what is known, written in books and taught. This accumulation of information and concepts is external, or objective, knowledge which is what a pupil often"learns" by rote. "The subject-matter is not used in carrying forward impulses and habits to significant results," [43] making it something lifeless and boring. The higher degree of learning is that which occupies the students with lessons that have a place in the fulfillment of some experience.

As persons in process, students should direct their learning toward the fulfillment of that process, i.e., attempt to reach the maximum development " . . . of initiative, of responsibility, of commitment and spiritual life . . . "[44]

To progress in the achievement of such a goal, one must have grasped the meaning of objects, situations, actions and events in a common sense in order to participate effectively in associated activities. The degree to which one can utilize experiences for greater personal growth and more effective participation in society is the degree of understanding one has of what has been learned.

When the meaning of present experiences is hidden, or a doubt or uncertainty about them plagues you, a restlessness sets in and is not quieted until the issue is settled. A source of action is undertaken to search out the obstacles, to try out tentative solutions, to speculate on probable consequences - in other words, an inquiry is organized to methodically study the doubt or problem. Such a procedure "is a set of operations in which problematic situations are disposed of or settled."[45] It is a set of reasoning operations, for as Dewey states: "Thinking . . . . is response to the doubtful as such."[46] This response can be fruitful only when those participating in the inquiry are prepared to reason, to respect one another mutually, and to exclude all indoctrination on the part of the teacher-guide.[47]

The question of teaching students to inquire, or teaching them to know or to learn, or to be rational, or even to be good, is, to my way of thinking, a question partly of semantics, partly of method, and greatly of freedom. Do we mean by "teaching" to impart factual information that must be memorized and repeated back, and nothing more? (Sadly, I must admit that I have seen a great deal of this type of teaching in Latin America.) Or is "teaching" understood more in terms of "teaching to . . ." or "teaching how to" rather than "teaching that . . ."? This distinction drawn so well by Gilbert Ryle[48] points to method as the key to encouraging students to run with the ball, so to speak, after the teacher-guide has helped them to develop the initial reasoning skills. This notion of artfully guiding the children in the process of learning how to learn, or how to inquire, or how to be good could be expressed in terms of helping the students teach themselves, which " . . . goes hand in glove with the notion of thinking for oneself."[49] A teacher can pour all the facts she likes into a student, but if the student cannot use those facts to discover meaning in his life experiences, or to recognize problems and work toward their solutions, or to create alternatives for societal situations, what was thought to be taught was never really learned.

At the heart of this topic is the respect for the student's freedom. "The most important problem in freedom of thinking is whether social conditions obstruct the development of judgment and insight or effectively promote it."[50] The gamut of existing social conditions that limit the development of learning and therefore of thinking skills, is far more vast then we'd like to believe, and frequently, the immediate teacher of the student is the least offensive, or better said, the least culpable.

Malnutrition, disease, inadequate housing and clothing greatly affect the intellectual capacities of millions of children and young adults. National budgets that designate a minimum percentage of the funds to education drastically limit the facilities necessary for good teaching and good learning. Salaries for teachers are often so low that only the most desperate (and usually that means those least prepared) will accept positions in the rural areas; others leave teaching if a more lucrative job is available. Higher education is controlled so that only the well-heeled can afford to enter the universities; selection of pre-professional studies is determined by one's ranking on the scale of the grades obtained on the obligatory entrance exams, and the pedagogical institute generally gets those not "bright enough" for other careers. The program of studies at all levels is controlled by the government - any innovations must be approved by the Ministry of Education. And on and on I could take the list of social conditions that obstruct the freedom of thinking.

If is understandable that an opportunity such as the Philosophy for Children Program offers to teachers, i.e., to help children learn to think for themselves, is at once both a challenge and a threat for them. For the most part, the teachers have never experienced the joy of going beyond what they had been taught to discover new truths by themselves or to find ever deeper meanings in their daily experiences, and so feel hesitant to try to lead their students along that way. The fear of losing control in the classroom, of not getting the required curriculum "covered", or of not being able to have the answers when the students would question them, are all obstacles to the process of becoming, both for pupils and for teachers.

Is there evidence of any rationality in systems that not only permit such conditions as those just described, but actually foster them? If to be rational means to have "the ability to

bring the subject-matter of prior experience to bear to perceive the significance of the subject-matter of a new experience . . ." to be " . . . habitually open to seeing an event which immediately strikes the senses not as an isolated thing but in its connection with the common experience of mankind." [51] (which is also in the process of becoming and in serious need of creative, constructive and renewing ideas), those systems are woefully short on rationality, and deprive their members of the opportunities to develop their rational capacities.

Restrictions on development of reasoning skills automatically affects the growth of moral consciousness in the student because principled behavior is rational behavior.

> "Morals means growth of conduct in meaning, at least it means that kind of expansion in meaning which is consequent upon observation of conditions and outcome of conduct. . . . In the largest sense of the word, morals is education."[52]

Education which equips children

> " . . . with the procedures that will enable them most effectively to explore and understand the subject-matter under discussion, to the end that they can think for themselves about the issues that the subject presupposes . . ."[53]

will see to it that the students have the opportunities to reflect upon behavior, that being their own or examples of conduct which they can identify, so as to see how it affects their own growing process present and future, and what consequences such behavior throws onto the community of which they are members.

Values are caught rather than taught, and so educators best teach them by modeling them. An innate sense of right and wrong is common, I believe, to all human beings, and responding rationally to that sense makes for personal integrity. In order to do so consistently, children need practice in recognizing situations that call for value judgments and in the skills necessary to sort out the elements which lead to proper moral behavior. Presenting them with examples that can fit into their resevoir of meaningful experiences, the procedure brings a reality to the students that they can understand and identify with, making it easier for them to discuss matter that affect them but which are difficult to handle when talked about in the first person.

This is a far cry from either indoctrinating students with rules of morality or fearing to touch moral issues at all. If we want our children to be just, we must show them as models people who practice justice, and be such models ourselves. If we wish our students to be loving, compassionate persons, we have to love and be compassionate with them. Nothing else would be logical - if we did not model what we teach regarding moral conduct which is based on good reasoning, the thinking skills we help the students to acquire would likewise not be modeled. What a tremendous privilege, and at the same time, what a sobering responsibility to be called to guide the young in their process of becoming fully "person"!

> "Man is a person, and education is the help given to the child so that he can develop himself and be inserted into society, progressively becoming aware of and taking possession of his personality and destiny."[54]
>
> A. M. Hartman

NOTES

1 Abbot, S.J., Walter, ed. "Gaudium et Spes" No. 3, *The Documents of Vatican II* (New York: Guild Press, 1966) p. 201.

2 Second General Conference of Latin American Bishops, "Education" No. 8, *The Church in the Present-Day Transformation* (General Secretariat of CELAM: Begeta, Colombia, 1968) p. 99.

3 Ibid., p. 98.

4 Ibid., p. 100.

5 Freire, Paule, *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (New York: Herder and Herder, 1970) p. 52.

6 Ibid., p. 52.

7 Ibid., p. 57 ff.

8 Pereira, Nieves, *Educacion Personalizada: Un Proyecto Pedagogico en Pierre Faure* (Madred: Narcea, S.A. Ediciones, 1976).

9 Paul VI, *Populorum Progressie* (On the Development of Peoples) 1967.

10 Pereira, Nieves, Op. cit., p. 35.

11 McDermott, John J., *The Philosphy of John Dewey, Vol. II The Lived Experience* (New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1973) pp. 443-445.

12 Pereira, Nieves, Op. cit., p. 37.

13 Ibid., p. 40.

14 Lopez Escalena, Sara, *Antropelogia y Educacion* (Santiago, Chile: Ediciones Paulinas, 1982) p. 31.

15 Dewey, John, *Experience and Education* (New York: Collier, 1938) p. 44.

16 de Cardin, Teilhard, *The Phenemenon of Man* (New York: Harper & Rew, 1961) p. 259.

17 Dewey, John, Op. cit., cit. p. 33.

18 Dewey, John, *Art as Experience* (New York: Capricorn Books, 1958) p. 262.

19 Michener, James A., *Space* (New York: Fawcett Crest, 1938) p. 575.

20 Dewey, John, *Experience and Nature* (Lasalle, Illinois: Open Court, 1929) p. 222.

21 Cf. Freire, Paule, Op. cit. Chapter 2, p. 57.

22 Dewey, John, *Experience and Nature,* Op. cit., p. 247.

23 Ibid., pp. 233-236.

24 Rogers, Carl R., *On Becoming a Person* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1961), p. 122.

25 Cf. Dewey's "Philosophies of Freedom", *On Experience, Nature, and Freedom* (New York: The Liberal Arts Press, 1960) p. 285.

26 Pereira, Nieves, Op. cit., pp. 42 - 43.

27 Cf. Dewey's *Democracy and Education,* Op, cit., p. 10.

28 Pereira, Nieves, Op. cit., p. 219.

[29] Rogers, Carl., Op. cit., p. 120.
[30] Merilla, Mercedes, "Comminicacion Intersubjetiva, Valores y Lenguaje" in *Educacion y Valores* (Madrid: Narcea, S.A. de Ediciones, 1979) p. 172.
[31] Dewey, John, *Democracy and Education,* Op. cit., p. 316.
[32] Acts of the Apostles 2:42 - 46.
[33] Dewey, John, *Democracy and Education,* Op. cit., p. 39.
[34] Ibid., p. 51.
[35] Dewey, John, *The Child & the Curriculum and The School and Society* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1956) p. 25.
[36] Dewey, John, *Experience and Education,* Op. cit., p. 75.
[37] Ibid., p. 71.
[38] Ibid., p. 71-72.
[39] Ibid., p. 49.
[40] Dewey, John, *Democracy and Education,* Op. cit., p. 340.
[41] Such as Israel Scheffler in "Conditions of Knowledge" in *Modern Philosophies of Education,* ed. John Paul Strain (New York: Random House, 1971).
[42] Dewey, John, *Democracy and Education*, Op. cit., p. 344.
[43] Ibid., p. 169.
[44] Perieira, Nieves, Op. cit., Cf. note No. 10.
[45] Dewey, John, *The Quest for Certainty* (New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1960) p. 229.
[46] Ibid., p. 224.
[47] Cf. Lipman, Matthew, Ann Margaret Sharp, Frederick S. Oscanyan, *Philosopny in the Classroom* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1980) p. 45.
[48] Cf. Ryle, Gilbert, "Teaching and Training" in *Modern Philosophies of Education,* Op. cit., p. 353 ff.
[49] Ibid., p. 353.
[50] Dewey, John, "Philosophies of Freedom", Op. cit., p. 285.
[51] Dewey, John, *Democracy and Education,* Op. cit., p. 343.
[52] Dewey, John, *Human Nature and Conduct* (New York: The Modern Library, 1950) p. 280.
[53] Lipman, Matthew, Ann Margaret Sharp, Frederick S. Oscanyan, *Philosophy in the Classroom,* Op. cit., p. 191.
[54] Pereira, Nieves, Op. cit., p. 37.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abbot, S.J., Walter M., ed. *The Documents of Vatican II.* New York. Guild Press. 1966.

de Chardin, Teilhard. *The Phenomenon of Man.* New York. Harper & Rew. 1961.

Dewey, John. *Art As Experience.* New York. Capricorn Books. 1958.

The Child & The Curriculum and The School & Society. Chicago. University of Chicago Press. 1956.

Democracy and Education. New York. The Free Press. Paperback Edition. 1966.

Experience and Education. New York. Colleer Books. 1938.

Experience and Nature. Lasalle, Illinois. Open Court. 1929.

Human Nature and Conduct. New York, The Modern Library. 1950.

Philosophy and Civilization. New York. Capricorn Books. 1963.

"Philosophies of Freedom" in *On Experience, Nature, and Freedom.* New York. The Liberal Arts Pres. 1960.

The Quest for Certainty. New York. G.P. Putnam's Sons. 1960.

Donaldson, Margaret. *Children's Minds.* Glasgow. Fontana/ Collins. 1978.

Froire, Paule. *Pedagogy of the Oppressed.* New York. Herder and Herder. 1970.

Jones, W.T. *The Twentieth Century to Wittgenstein and Sartre.* New York. Harcourt, Bruce and Jonanovich. 2nd Ed. Revised. 1975.

Lipman, Matthew, Ann Margaret Sharp, Frederick S. Oscanyan. *Philosophy in the Classroom.* Philadelphia. Temple University Press. 1980.

Lopez Escalena, Sara. *Antropolgia y Educacien.* Santiago, Chile. Ediciones Paulinas. 1982.

Michener, James A. *Space.* New York. Fawcett Crest. 1983.

Morilla, Mercedes. *Educacien y Valores.* Madrid. Narcea S.A. de Ediciones Paulinas. 1981.

McDermott, John J. *The Philosophy of John Dewey: Vol. II, The Lived Experience.* New York. G.P. Putnam's Sons. 1973.

Paul IV. *Populorum Progressio.* 1967.

Pereira, Nieves. *Educacion Personalizada: Un Proyecto Pedagogico en Pierre Faure.* Madrid. Narcea S.A. de Edicioes. 1976.

Rogers, Carl R. *On Becoming a Person.* Boston, Houghton Mifflin Company. 1961.

Ryle, Gilbert. "Teaching and Training" in *Modern Philosophies of Education,* ed. John Paul Strain. New York. Random House. 1971.

Scheffler, Israel. "Conditions of Knowledge" in *Modern Philosophies of Education,* ed. John Paul Strain, New York. Random House. 1971.

Segunda Conferencia General del Episcopado Latinoamericano. *Documentos Finales de Medellin.* Buenes Aires, Argintina. Ediciones Paulinas. 1968.